



## THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Gilder et al.  
Serial No. : 09/836,690  
Filed : April 17, 2001  
Title : SAFETY RAZORS

Art Unit : 3724  
Examiner : Kenneth E. Peterson

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*Handwritten signatures and notes:*  
H.C.  
Election  
3/21/02  
✓ M/S/et

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Responsive to the office action mailed January 24, 2002, application owner respectfully traverses the requirement for restriction and provisionally elects Group I, claims 3 and 12 for further prosecution in this application should the requirement for restriction not be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 121 reads, "If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions." Thus, restriction is proper only if the inventions are "independent and distinct." M.P.E.P. headed 802.01, "Meaning of 'Independent', 'Distinct' reads as follows:

**INDEPENDENT**

The term "independent" (i.e., not dependent) means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed, that is, they are unconnected in design, operation or effect, for example, (1) species under a genus which species are not usable together as disclosed or (2) process and apparatus incapable of being used in practicing the process.

RECEIVED  
MAR 21 2002  
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL**

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

February 28, 2002

Date of Deposit

Signature

Jennifer Leveille  
Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

DISTINCT

The term "distinct" means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, for example as combination and part (subcombination) thereof, process and apparatus for its practice, process and product made, etc., but are capable of separate manufacture, use or sale as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER (though they may each be unpatentable because of the prior art). It will be noted that in this definition the term "related" is used as an alternative for "dependent" in referring to subjects other than independent subjects.

The Examiner has not shown that the claims in each group "ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER." Should the requirement for restriction be repeated, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rule that the claims in each Group "ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER."

The Examiner has made no showing whatsoever that the inventions are INDEPENDENT.

M.P.E.P. 803 provides, "If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

And M.P.E.P. 803.01 provides, "IT STILL REMAINS IMPORTANT FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST THAT NO REQUIREMENTS BE MADE WHICH MIGHT RESULT IN THE ISSUANCE OF TWO PATENTS FOR THE SAME INVENTION.

Manifestly, search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has recognized that "independent and distinct" means "independent and distinct." *In re Weber*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 328 (C.C.P.A. 1978); *In re Haas*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 334, 336 (C.C.P.A. 1978).

In a decision dated June 23, 1977, on a petition filed June 13, 1977, Group 1210 Director Alfred L. Leavitt in granting the petition to withdraw the requirement for restriction said:

Applicant : Gilder et al.  
Serial No. : 09/836,690  
Filed : April 17, 2001  
Page : 3-3

Attorney's Docket No.: 00216-396003 / Case 4225 B

Current Office policy is not to require restriction between related inventions when no substantial burden is involved in the examination of all claims in a single application.

And in a decision dated 3 December 1993 on a petition filed March 12, 1993, Group 1100 Deputy Director John Doyle said:

Restriction was required between (I)method for epitaxial deposition and (II)epitaxially deposited product (Paper No. 4). However, the examiner failed to present any convincing basis for the holding that the inventions as above grouped are distinct. The claimed inventions must be independent or distinct, and the examiner "must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions . . .". Further, the field of search for the alleged distinct inventions is seen to be coextensive, hence, no serious burden is seen to be incurred by examination of all pending claims. MPEP 803 under "Criteria For Restriction Between Patentably Distinct Inventions".

The Petition is GRANTED.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn and all the claims be examined on the merits.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb 29, 2002

William E. Booth  
William E. Booth  
Reg. No. 28,933

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906